



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,029	08/18/2003	Christopher D. Smith	555255012441	3221
33070	7590	07/29/2008	EXAMINER	
JOSEPH M. SAUER JONES DAY REAVIS & POGUE NORTH POINT, 901 LAKESIDE AVENUE CLEVELAND, OH 44114			DARNO, PATRICK A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2163		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/29/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/643,029	SMITH, CHRISTOPHER D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PATRICK A. DARNO	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 and 54 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 and 54 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02252008</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. No new claims have been added. No claims have been amended. Claims 18-53 have been cancelled. Claims 1-17 and 54 are pending in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-2, 5-13, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,980,817 issued to Albert Chow et al. (hereinafter “Chow”).

Claim 1:

Chow discloses a system for triggering a provision event in a service provider using a provisioning request message stored in a computer-readable medium generated by an external system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6*), comprising:

a provisioning system operable to receive the provisioning request message from the external system and transmit information in the provisioning request message to trigger the provisioning event, the provisioning system being a separate entity from the external system and the service provider (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

the provisioning request message including an entity to which the provisioning event pertains, wherein the information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system

(*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

the provisioning system in communication with the external system and the service provider , wherein the service provider is operable to communicate with the entity to cause the provisioning event to occur in response to receiving the provisioning request message from the provisioning system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*);

the service provider operable to provide mobile communication service to the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36*).

Claim 2:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a name attribute that identifies the entity (*Chow: column 13, lines 59-64; Note that the point-of-sale information includes the subscriber name.*).

Claim 5:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the service provider is a mobile data service provider (*Chow: column 2, line 47 – column 3, line 3*).

Claim 6:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the provisioning request message further includes provisioning data that identifies a

particular entity to which the provisioning event pertains (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the unique electronic serial identification number (MSID).*).

Claim 7:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the particular entity is a mobile communication device (*Chow: column 13, line 52 – column 14, line 6 and column 2, lines 43-46; The mobile station (MS) is the mobile communication device.*).

Claim 8:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 6, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the provisioning data includes one or more attributes defined by the external system (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; The attributes defined by the external system include subscriber name, address, credit card number, unique mobile station identification number (MSID), optional personal identification number (PIN) and other verification numbers.*).

Claim 9:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 8, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a name attribute that identifies a type of information included within the provisioning data (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least subscriber name.*).

Claim 10:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a personal identification number (PIN) for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 – column 14, line 6; See at least personal identification number (PIN).*).

Claim 11:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a product identifier for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the unique mobile station identification number (MSID).*).).

Claim 12:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a billing identifier for the entity (*Chow: column 2, lines 47-65 and column 13, line 52 - column 14, line 6; See at least the credit card number.*)).

Claim 13:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, and Chow further discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes an international mobile subscriber identity identifier (IMSI) for the entity (*Chow: column 14, lines 29-31*).

Claim 54:

Claim 54 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-4, 14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0087300 issued to John Ervin Lewis (hereinafter “Lewis”).

Claim 3:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, but Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein the one or more attributes include a type attribute that identifies an entity type of the entity.

However, Lewis discloses wherein the one or more attributes include a type attribute that identifies an entity type of the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 5-9*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chow with the teachings of Lewis noted above for the purpose of including a destination device type inside a provisioning request (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 5-9 and paragraph [0127], lines 1-5; First note that the routing information contains a device type. Then note that the routing information is part of the overall provisioning message to be sent.*). The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the invention of Chow per the above such that the destination device type would aid in the delivery process of the provisioning request (*Lewis: paragraph [0151], lines 5-8*).

Claim 4:

The combination of Chow and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 3, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses wherein the type attribute identifies a model number of the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0361], lines 1-4; The mobile identification number is the model number.*).

Claim 14:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, but Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a mobile subscriber integrated services digital network number (MSISDN) for the entity.

However, Lewis discloses wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes a mobile subscriber integrated services digital network number (MSISDN) for the entity (*Lewis: paragraph [0388], lines 1-6 and paragraph [0319]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Chow with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Chow per the above such that the MSISDN could be used to indicate the mobile directory number for a particular device (*Lewis: paragraph [0388], lines 1-6 and paragraph [0319]*).

Claim 16:

Chow discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, and but Chow does not explicitly disclose wherein the provisioning request message includes additional information identifying one or more additional entities to which the provisioning event pertains, and wherein the additional information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system.

However, Lewis discloses wherein the provisioning request message includes additional information identifying one or more additional entities to which the provisioning event pertains, and wherein the additional information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system (*Lewis: paragraphs [0172] and [0173]; These references disclose sending provisioning requests to multiple or additional users. The multiple users are taken from a distribution list and all the users receive the same messages.*

Further additional users can be added to any list. Further for each additional user device type, destination address, and all other attributes are included in the message (this is equivalent to the provisioning entity and provisioning data item sections).).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Chow with the teachings of Lewis noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to the teachings of Chow per the above such that a single message would contain routing information for multiple devices (*Lewis: paragraph [0121], lines 1-5*).

Claim 17:

The combination of Chow and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 16, as noted above, and Lewis further discloses wherein a data structure relationship between the provisioning entity section and the one or more additional provisioning entity sections is defined by the external system (*Lewis: paragraphs [0172]-[0173]; The distribution list on the external system creates the data structure relationship between the additional entities.*).

4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow in further view of Lewis and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0058652 issued to Christopher M. McGregor et al. (hereinafter “McGregor”).

Claim 15:

The combination of Chow and Lewis discloses all the elements of claim 9, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose wherein the type of information included within the provisioning data includes an integrated circuit card identifier

(ICCID) for the entity. However, McGregor discloses wherein the provisioning data includes an integrated circuit card identifier (ICCID) for the entity (*McGregor: paragraph [0201]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of McGregor noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above such that the ICCID could be used to identify a particular mobile device (*McGregor: paragraph [0201], at least lines 3-7*).

Response to Arguments

Applicant Argues:

In contrast, independent claims 1 and 54 describe the interaction between three separate entities - a provisioning system, a service provider, and an external system - for the purpose of causing the service provider to perform a provisioning event for an identified entity (mobile device) that receives a mobile communication service provided by the service provider.

Clearly, nothing similar to this process is disclosed by the Chow reference. Rather, in Chow's system the provisioning event is triggered by a phone call from the mobile device itself, not by a communication from a separate provisioning system that is acting in response to a provisioning request message from an external system.

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. After a further review of the prior art of record, it appears that Chow discloses interaction between three separate entities which are equivalent to the three separate entities claimed by the Applicant.

Specifically, Chow discloses communication between a provisioning system [Chow: column 13, line 66 - column 14, line 6 and column 10, lines 28-36; The “LCS Customer Service Center” is the equivalent of the claimed provisioning system.], a service provider [Chow: column 2, lines 47-49 and column 13, lines 59-60; The “service provider” is the equivalent of the claimed service provider.], and an external

system [Chow: column 2, lines 47-49 and column 10, lines 32-36 and column 13, lines 54-56; The “retail outlet” is the equivalent of the claimed external system.]. Furthermore, Chow discloses wherein the provisioning event is triggered by a communication from a separate provisioning system that is acting in response to a provisioning request message from an external system [Chow: column 10, lines 32-36 and column 14, lines 3-6].

To further elaborate, note particularly that first, a potential subscriber purchases a mobile device from a retail outlet (external system) [see at least Chow: column 13, lines 54-56]. Next, the retail outlet (external system) generates and sends a provisioning request message to the LCS Customer Service Center (provisioning system) [see at least Chow: column 47-52 and column 10, lines 32-36; The service registration using “point-of-sale” information appears to be equivalent to the claimed “provisioning request message”. And note that the retail outlet, or external system, can contact the LCS Customer Service Center directly to submit this message. This is stated in at least three portions of the Chow reference (Chow: column 10, lines 32-36 “LCS CSC supports at least service registration of a MS from a retail location” and Chow: column 59-60 “retailer may register a subscriber” and Chow: column 14, lines 3-6 “retailer can dial from retail outlet”).]. The LCS Customer Service Center then verifies the users information received in this message and activates, enables, or triggers a mobile service being provided to a mobile device from a network service provider [see at least Chow: column 2, lines 61-64 and column 14, lines 3-9 and column 14, lines 41-44; Note that the LCS Customer Service Center “verifies” that service should be provided and communicates a feature code which permits a mobile service, provided by the service provider, to be activated.].

Since it appears that each and every element of the Applicant’s claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected for at least the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PATRICK A. DARNO whose telephone number is (571)272-0788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2163

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hung T Vy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163

/Patrick A. Darno/
Examiner
Art Unit 2163
07-20-2008

PAD